



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner called on Oct. 21, 2010, and spoke with the Applicant's attorney, Doran Pace. The Examiner indicated that claims limited in scope to claim 4 would be allowable, and this would be an allowable linking claim, therefore, any claims that are linked by claim 4 would be rejoined because all claims that include the limitations of claim 4 as their special technical feature would have unity of invention over the prior art. The Examiner wanted to know if the Applicant would give permission to Examiner's amendments that would re-write claim 4 in independent format, cancel claims 1-3, and amend the remaining claims to be of the same scope. The Examiner based this determination on the data provided in Table 3 on page 31 of the specification. The attorney consulted with the applicant and called the Examiner back on Oct. 22, 2010. The attorney informed the Examiner that the Applicant did not want to agree to these amendments at this point in time, and indicated that they would prefer to have a rejection in writing before they cancel claims and narrow their claims.